

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/460,222 12/13/99 MIYAGAWA

N JEL-28567RE-

EXAMINER

WM02/0524

JAMES E LEDBETTER ESQ  
STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER L L P  
1615 L STREET NW  
P O BOX 34387 SUITE 850  
WASHINGTON DC 20043-4387

HINDI, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2651

DATE MAILED:

05/24/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/460,222

Applicant(s)

Miyagawa et al

Examiner

NABIL HINDI

Art Unit

2651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr. 06, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 28-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26 and 28-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2651

In response to applicant's amendment dated March 15, 2001 and Apr. 06, 2001. The following action is taken:

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to identify at least one different error from that cited in patent reissue 08/396,981 which is relied upon to support the reissue application. See 37 CAR 1.175(a)(1) and M.E.P... § 1414.

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to contain a statement that **all** errors which are being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing of the oath/declaration arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant. See 37 CAR 1.175 and M.E.P... § 1414.

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37CFR 1.175 and M.E.P... § 1414) because of the following:

1. The declaration does not adequately identify at least one different error from that cited in the reissue patent 08/396, 981 that supports the filing of the reissue since that error has apparently been corrected in the parent reissue. 37CFR 1.175 (a)(1).
2. The declaration does not state that **all** errors correction in this application arose without any deceptive intention on the part of applicant.

Art Unit: 2651

Claims 26, and 29-34 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CAR 1.175.

1. Claims 26, and 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.


Applicant amended claims 1, 7 and 10 to include the limitation "an objective lens for converging the light flux onto a disk", "N optical heads", "N optical heads moving means" and "disk discriminating means". Such limitations are now removed from the present application. Similarly, claims 13, 16 and 19 were amended to include the limitation "plural converging grating couplers" which is now removed. This is an improper recapture of the claims.

**A certificate of correction is requested for the parent reissue application citing all related reissue application.**

Art Unit: 2651

**Applicant is hereby reminded that the new supplemental declaration should cover all the errors corrected from the filing of the reissue applicant to the amendment filed Aug. 25, 2000.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to NABIL.HINDI  
at telephone number (703) 308.1555

  
NABIL HINDI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2500  
2651